

To appear in XVIIIth IAP Colloquium, *On the Nature of Dark Energy: observational and theoretical results on the accelerating universe*, ed. P. Brax, J. Martin & J. P. Uzan

Constraints on dark energy and quintessence with a comoving standard ruler applied to 2dF quasars

Gary A. Mamon^{1,2}, Boud F. Roukema³

¹*Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, 98 bis Bd Arago, F-75014 Paris, FRANCE*

²*GEPI, Observatoire de Paris, 61 av de l'Observatoire, F-75014 Paris, FRANCE*

³*Torun Centre for Cosmology, University of Nicolas Copernicus, ul. Gagarina 11, PL-87100 Torun, POLAND*

Abstract. Structures on very large scales (> 100 Mpc) have negligible peculiar motions, and are thus roughly fixed in comoving space. We looked for significant peaks at very large separation in the two-point correlation function — corrected for redshift selection effects — of a well converged subsample of 2378 quasars of the recently released 10k sample of the 2dF quasar survey. Dividing our sample in three redshift intervals, we find a peak at $\simeq 244 h^{-1}$ Mpc, which is perfectly comoving for a restricted set of cosmological parameters, namely $\Omega_m = 0.25 \pm 0.15$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.65 \pm 0.35$ (both at 95% confidence). Assuming a flat Universe, we constrain the quintessence parameter $w_Q < -0.35$ (95% confidence). We discuss the compatibility of our analysis with possible peaks in the power spectrum.

1 Introduction

The quest for the parameters of the primordial Universe has significantly advanced in the last 10 years. There is a general agreement that $\Omega_m \simeq 0.3$, for example from the internal kinematics of clusters and groups [11], from the gas fraction in clusters [20] and groups [6]. Supernovae used as standard candles have led to $\Omega_\Lambda > 0$, with a degeneracy with Ω_m . Finally, the scales of the angular fluctuations of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) lead to a nearly perfectly flat Universe $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$. The combination of constraints from supernovae and the CMB recovers $\Omega_m \simeq 0.3$ (with $\Omega_\Lambda \simeq 0.3$).

We present below a measurement of the cosmological parameters, with a fairly new technique based upon using very large scale structures (> 100 Mpc in size) as comoving standard rulers.

2 Very large-scale structures should follow the Hubble flow

Very large-scale structures should follow the Hubble flow. The rms peculiar velocity within a ball of radius R is given by

$$v_{\text{rms}}^2(R) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (Hf)^2 \int_0^\infty \widetilde{W}^2(kR) P(k) dk, \quad (1)$$

where for $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ or for flat Universes, $f \simeq \Omega_m^{0.6}$, while $P(k)$ is the primordial density fluctuation spectrum,¹ and $\widehat{W}(x) = 3(\sin x - x \cos x)/x^3$ is the Fourier transform of the top-hat smoothing kernel. Eq. (1) leads to a present-day value $v_{\text{rms},0} < 330 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for $R > 100 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. Since the peculiar velocity increases with time, one simply finds that the peculiar motion satisfies $\delta R < v_{\text{rms},0} t_0 = 3.3 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$, so that peculiar motions account for less than 3% for structures larger than $100 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$. Thus, VLSS follow the Hubble expansion to good precision, or, in other words, *very large scale structures should be comoving standard rulers*.

3 Is there a specific scale for very large scale structures?

Since the report [2] of a redshift periodicity of structures on the scale of $130 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc} = 2\pi/(0.048 h \text{ Mpc}^{-1})$, the existence of a preferred scale for very large scale structures, has been a matter of debate. As seen in Table 1, whereas many authors find sig-

Table 1: Power spectra from wide surveys

Ref.	Year	Survey	Objects	Number	Peak	Dip	Notes
					$(h \text{ Mpc}^{-1})$		
[4]	1997	ACO	clusters	869	0.05		
[18]	1998	APM	clusters	364		0.08	
[12]	2001	ACO	clusters	637		0.04	
[17]	2001	REFLEX	clusters	452			
[21]	2001	XBACS	clusters	242		0.035	
[21]	2001	BCS	clusters	301	0.08		
[10]	1996	LCRS	galaxies	24000			
[5]	2000	PSCz	galaxies	12400	0.028	0.036	1
[13]	2001	2dF	galaxies	100000		0.1	2
[19]	2002	2dF	galaxies	100000	0.05	0.1	3
[7]	2002	2dF	quasars	10000	0.069		

Notes: 1) marginal peak and dip; 2) not deconvolved for survey geometry; 3) $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.2, 0.8)$

nificant peaks and dips in $P(k)$, measured from large surveys, they do not agree on their positions. In what follows, we will assume that there *is* a feature (peak or dip) in $P(k)$, which should lead to a quasi-periodic signal in the space distribution that is essentially frozen in comoving space.

4 The comoving standard ruler applied to quasars

After previous attempts [14, 15] on a low spectral resolution survey of quasars [8], we have analyzed the 2dF quasar sample, called 2QZ-10k [3], publicly made available in the Spring of 2001. After discarding poorly sampled regions (where the

¹We adopt, as the observers, the high definition of $P(k)$ ($[2\pi]^3$ higher than the low one).

We find oscillations in the $15 h^{-1}$ Mpc gaussian smoothed correlation function that are 25 times smaller than found by [16]. We check this by considering a feature in $P(k)$ at wavenumber k_0 that has amplitude L^3 and width Δ decades in $\log k$. If $\Delta \ll 1$, Eq. (2) yields $\xi \simeq \ln 10 / (2\pi^2) (k_0 L)^3 \Delta \sin(k_0 r) / (k_0 r)$. If $\xi(r) \propto \sin(k_0 r) / (k_0 r)$ has a secondary maximum at $k_0 r_0 = 5\pi/2$, then $L^3 \Delta = 8 \xi(r_0) r_0^3 / (25 \ln 10)$. For $r_0 = 244 h^{-1}$ Mpc and $\xi(r_0) \simeq 0.03$ [16], we need $L^3 \Delta \simeq 6 \times 10^4 h^{-3} \text{Mpc}^3 = 1.5 P(k_0)$. So if the spike is, say, one-tenth of a decade wide, we need to locally boost $P(k)$ by a factor 15, whereas the measured peak [7] is only a factor 2 above the interpolated $P(k)$.

It seems clear that there is an inconsistency between these two analyses, and we are presently redoing our analysis of $\xi(r)$ from 2QZ-10k to resolve this question. Whether $\xi(r)$ or $P(k)$ is the better tool for detecting comoving standard rulers across distinct redshift intervals remains an open question.

Acknowledgements. We thank Jim Fry for helpful discussions on power spectra.

References

- [1] Allen S. W., 1998, MNRAS 296, 392
- [2] Broadhurst T. J., Ellis R. S., Koo D. C., Szalay A. S., 1990, Nature 343, 726
- [3] Croom S. M., Smith R. J., Boyle B. J., et al., 2001, MNRAS 322, L29
- [4] Einasto J., Einasto M., Gottloeber S., et al., 1997, Nature 385, 139
- [5] Hamilton A. J. S., Tegmark M., 2002, MNRAS 330, 506
- [6] Henriksen M. J., Mamon G. A., 1994, ApJL 421, L63
- [7] Hoyle F., Outram P. J., Shanks T., et al., 2002, MNRAS 329, 336
- [8] Iovino A., Clowes R., Shaver P., 1996, A&AS 119, 265
- [9] Landy S. D., Szalay A. S., 1993, ApJ 412, 64
- [10] Lin H., Kirshner R. P., Shectman S. A., et al., 1996, ApJ 471, 617
- [11] Mamon G. A., 1993, eds Combes F., Athanassoula E., in *Gravitational Dynamics and the N-Body Problem*. Obs. de Paris, Paris, p. 188, arXiv:astro-ph/9308032
- [12] Miller C. J., Batuski D. J., 2001, ApJ 551, 635
- [13] Percival W. J., Baugh C. M., Bland-Hawthorn J., et al., 2001, MNRAS 327, 1297
- [14] Roukema B. F., Mamon G. A., 2000, A&A 358, 395
- [15] Roukema B. F., Mamon G. A., 2001, A&A 366, 1
- [16] Roukema B. F., Mamon G. A., Bajtlik S., 2002, A&A 382, 397
- [17] Schuecker P., Böhringer H., Guzzo L., et al., 2001, A&A 368, 86
- [18] Tadros H., Efstathiou G., Dalton G., 1998, MNRAS 296, 995
- [19] Tegmark M., Hamilton A. J. S., Xu Y., 2002, MNRAS 335, 887
- [20] White S. D. M., Navarro J. F., Evrard A. E., Frenk C. S., 1993, Nature 366, 429
- [21] Zandivarez A., Abadi M. G., Lambas D. G., 2001, MNRAS 326, 147